

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-27 are currently pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 8, 12, and 27 are amended,<sup>1</sup> and claims 13 and 16 are canceled. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all remaining claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The previous enablement rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been withdrawn with respect to claims 1-11 but has been maintained with respect to claims 12-27.<sup>2</sup> The basis for that rejection is that the only difference in microstructure disclosed in the specification – with respect to both the powder particles per se and the ultimate TBC layers – is in the porosity. Consistent with the previous amendment to independent claim 1, independent claims 12 and 27 have been amended to refer more specifically to different porosities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Independent claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by EP 0 605 196 (EP ‘196). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As alluded to in the previous Response, in EP ‘196, the porosity of the different TBC layers is varied by varying the temperature of the substrate to which the layers are being applied. In the present invention, in contrast, the porosity of the particles themselves differs before they are even applied to the substrate. See, for example, paragraphs [0040] through [0043] of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Claims 1, 7, and 8 are allowed. These claims are modified slightly for readability or proper form.

<sup>2</sup> The Office Action incorrectly states in the first line of page 4 that the rejection has been maintained with respect to claims 1-27 (previously canceled claims not being accounted for). Complete reading of the Office Action makes it clear, however, that that line was intended to refer to claims 12-27.

specification.<sup>3</sup> Claim 27 is amended to reflect this feature more clearly. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection is overcome and respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance, and timely Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.


\*\*\*\*\*

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.0056.NPUS01.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tracy W. Druce". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Tracy" and last name "Druce" clearly distinguishable.

Tracy W. Druce, Esq.  
Reg. No. 35,493  
Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP  
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 571-3400  
(713) 456-2836 (fax)  
[tracy.druce@novakdruce.com](mailto:tracy.druce@novakdruce.com)

---

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph [0042] is amended to correct an obvious error. The corrected sentence clearly did not read properly prior to the correction.